UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

"TRENDS IN PRESENT-DAY RELIGION"

Beginning in the issue of November 13, UNITY will publish in each succeeding number an important new series of ten or more articles on "Trends in Present-Day Religion."

Protestant Modernism	A. Eustace Haydon
Advance Movements in Judaism	Jacob J. Weinstein
Catholic Modernism	Bernard Eugene Meland
The Future of Liberal Protestantism	Albert C. Dieffenbach
Barthianism	Wilhelm Pauck
The Oxford Group Movement	Samuel M. Shoemaker, Jr.
Baha'ism	Horace Holley
Natural Mysticism	Edward Scribner Ames
Humanism	J. A. C. Fagginer Auer
New Thought and Allied Movements	Charles W. Ferguson
Present-Day Philosophy	Oliver L. Reiser

This series will be completed with an article on "The Future of the Church," by an author to be nominated by the readers of UNITY. Send in your suggestions.

If you are not already a subscriber, send in your subscription now so you will not miss one of these articles.

VOLUME CXII NUMBER 5

Chicago, October 30, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bi-Weekly
Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00
Single Copies 10 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 71
Jottings—J. H. H. 75

ARTICLES—

Selected—*Benjamin Franklin* 71
The Voice Above the Struggle—SYDNEY STRONG 73
A Study of the New Defeatism—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 75
Anachronistic Survivals—THEODORE E. LAPP 77
The German Revolution and the Versailles Treaty—
TARAKNATH DAS 79

THE STUDY TABLE—

Latin America—FREDERICK STARR 80

CORRESPONDENCE—

From Our Bulgarian Correspondent—P. M. MATTHÉEFF 82
Fascism in America—R. J. WESTLAKE 83
"A Song of Revolt"—JAMES H. WEST 83
Conditions in Germany 83

THE FIELD—

The Truth About Einstein—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 70

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Truth About Einstein

EDITOR'S NOTE: *This letter was sent to "The Voice of the People" in the "Chicago Tribune," and a copy was sent to* UNITY. *The Tribune declined to publish it.*

Chicago Tribune.

Sir:

There is a remarkable inconsistency, to the observing, in the manner in which the *Tribune* editorially deplores the recrudescence of militarism, fanatical nationalism and tyranny in Germany under the spell of Hitler and his neo-paganism, while simultaneously rebuking, at every opportunity, those who are most courageous in opposing the same phenomena elsewhere, particularly in America. The case of Dr. Einstein and his alleged repudiation of his avowed pacifist convictions neatly illustrates this, while egregiously misrepresenting him, and I trust that you will allow me to point this out to you, for the sake of correcting what amounts to a gratuitous insult offered in your columns to a very distinguished scientist and servant of mankind.

The *Tribune* published conspicuously a dispatch, under a date-line of September 9th, from Brussels, Belgium, with headlines reading: "Einstein Urges Belgium to Get Ready for War; Famous Scientist Drops Pacifist Views." It followed this two days later with a cartoon on the front page and an editorial frying the bacon of satisfaction over the professor's discovery of the relativity of ethical principles, of the reason for the existence of Mars and the necessity of preparing for war, under certain peculiarly menacing circumstances prevailing in Europe today, largely because of the atrocities practiced by the devotees of Mars in the recent past. The editor ended his little homily with a rare piece of didactic misrepresentation as follows:

Now that he (Einstein) admits that he was wrong on pacifism he should also realize that he was wrong on communism and, a refugee, cease preaching the overthrow of the government that has given him asylum.

Both assertions, as it happens, are quite untrue. The professor is more interested in arriving at truth than in reiterating a favorite dogma, contrary to some writers.

(*Continued on page* 84)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXII MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1933 Number 5

In what light we are viewed by superior beings may be gathered from a piece of late West India news, which possibly has not reached you. A young Angel of distinction, being sent down to this world on some important business, for the first time, had an old courier spirit assigned him as his guide; they arrived over the seas of Martinico, in the middle of the long day of obstinate fights between the fleets of Rodney and De Grasse. When through the clouds of smoke he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs, and bodies dead or dying; the ships sinking, burning, or blown high into the air; and the quantity of pain, misery and destruction the crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing 'round to one another; he turned angrily to his guide and said—"You blundering blockhead! you undertook to conduct me to the earth, and you have brought me to Hell!"—"No sir," says the guide, "I have made no mistake; this is really the earth, and these are men. Devils never treat one another in this cruel manner; they have more sense, and more of what men vainly call humanity."—*Benjamin Franklin, to Joseph Priestley.*

Our horror of the Hitler regime in Germany should not blind us to the fact that the withdrawal of the Reich from the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations is simply the latest chapter of that long history of Allied cruelty and repression which has been running ever since the signing of the Versailles Treaty. The triumphant and revengeful victors in the Great War, predominantly France and England, drove Germany to Hitler, and now are driving Hitler to revolt. Not that Hitler needs much driving, but only the excuse which his enemies are so abundantly giving him! Senator Borah stated the facts when he traced back this awful crisis straight to the Versailles Treaty, and referred to "the economic and financial war which has been going on in Europe ever since the Armistice." There will "never be peace," he continued, "never be disarmament until the Versailles Treaty has been rewritten"—or, as we would put it, scrapped altogether. Raymond Leslie Buell, Research Director of the Foreign Policy Association, said much the same thing when he declared, on that fateful Saturday, that the Powers were trying to force upon Germany principles that they were "unwilling to apply to themselves." The Reich, in other words, was wholly justified in demanding equality in arms in the face of the refusal of the Allies to fulfil their promises to reduce armaments. If war should follow upon this event—as it will not now, since nobody wants war less today than the Nazi leader!—it would be France, England, Italy, and in part the United States which were to blame, as it is these same nations which are to blame for Germany's withdrawal from Geneva. Imagine this country refusing Germany equality, when we are at this moment enormously increasing our navy, so as to gain equality with Britain and Japan! Meanwhile, whatever the rights and wrongs in this particular case, there remains Hitler, the awful menace to peace, and indeed to the whole ordered future of mankind. What may happen before this editorial is printed, is not pleasant to think of. Hope, which "builds from its own wreck the thing it contemplates," is all that we have left to cling to.

It seems to be the very general judgment everywhere—nowhere more so than in Washington—that the NRA has failed—or rather, shall we say, accomplished all that it was ever capable of accomplishing, which was never very much. It has failed only in so far as it has fallen short of extravagant forecasts and crazy prophecies which never should have been given to the people. The success of the NRA in itself is substantial—first, in changing the temper of a nation; secondly, in cutting down the frightful mass total of unemployment; and thirdly, and most important, in initiating certain basic reforms in the industrial order which must endure. But the momentum of the NRA campaign has now practically stopped—it cannot carry us farther. What remains to be done is not a wild whipping up of the NRA, which, like a spent horse, cannot go on—not, we pray, a resort to desperate measures of inflation, which would wreck everything—but a new plan for a new campaign directed straight toward the goal at which the NRA was aimed, but which it could not, in the nature of the case, hope of itself to reach. The next steps are obvious and drastic—a taking over by the government of the railroads, the basic industries (coal, oil, steel, power), and, if the administration has the courage it ought to have had last March, the banks. The basic snag under the present plan is the dominance of the great industrial groups, freed from the menace of the anti-trust laws, absolute masters over production and prices, as hungry as ever for profits, staggering under debts which can only be paid out of profits, and determined, whether or no, to subdue labor and exploit the consumer. Against this immense wall of private ownership, the NRA can only beat itself to pieces like the waves of the Atlantic on

the cliffs of Maine. A magnificent spectacle—but nothing more! But this is Socialism, you say! Precisely—if you must call it something! But it is either Socialism, or Fascism—there is no other alternative save that of chaos and ruin. And of these two, we infinitely prefer Socialism!

How superficial is all the talk today about a planned capitalism, a united front, etc., is shown by the essential conflicts which have long been raging under the NRA, and throwing it into confusion. The Recovery Act has inevitably lost momentum, as we have just said; but it has also lost direction. Such drive as it has had is now being absorbed by internal struggle and strife. Look at the contending forces! The farmers against the industrial workers, with the former clamoring for inflation and the latter (see the A. F. of L. resolution) flatly opposed. Capital against labor, and both against the consumer. Monopolists and chain store interests against the small, individual, independent manufacturer or merchant. Domestic trade against foreign trade. And always, in such a crisis as this, the sound money advocate against the inflationist! These interests are all fighting one another in one grand melée of confusion—and we wonder that the NRA is not saving the nation! What has been going on in recent months is a first-class demonstration of the fact that capitalism, in the very nature of the case, cannot be planned, or organized, or reduced to order. Our existing economic system provides for nothing but a struggle for plunder. This struggle can be subjected to direction—the riot by the mob can be changed into a battle of disciplined soldiers. There are rules of war—why not codes of industry? But the struggle still remains what it is—a fight for power, in which the strong overcome the weak, and the favored few exploit the helpless many. There can be nothing really achieved until the incentive to plunder is removed, and the struggle therefore ended. Which means that capitalism must not be restored, or revitalized, or reordered, but transformed into a true industrial commonwealth! "Commonwealth" is a wonderful word—especially when it is made to mean what it says!

In classifying pacifists and radicals with criminals, the American Legion characteristically allied itself with all the vast movement of violent intolerance now sweeping the world, and showed itself to be the true Nazi movement in America. For the Hitlerites do not limit their orgies of hate and destruction to the Jews. On the contrary, the pacifists and political radicals of Germany are persecuted by the Brown Shirts even more terribly than the sons of Israel—and on the very ground laid down by our own Legion, that they are criminals against the state. We were told, before this recent convention of the American Legion, that the veterans were going to behave, and at last show themselves, for the first time, unselfish supporters of the government. The superb address of Mr. Roosevelt, clear, honest, straightforward, and courageous, stirred hope that the Legionnaires would really reform. But now that the record is written, we find that they comprise the same old crowd of exploiters, as selfish as they dare under existing circumstances to be. We quote from a summary of the action of the Chicago Convention as published editorially in the New York *World-Telegram*:

> It patriotically buried the Patman bonus demand; but it urged another costly piece of class legislation, the waiver of the 3½ per cent interest on $1,500,000,000 of bonus loans.
>
> It buried a resolution demanding repeal of last spring's economy act; but it sought to destroy the spirit of that act by demanding hospitalization and "full" care for widows and orphans regardless of whether the veterans were incapacitated or killed in war or peace.
>
> Surely these demands do not square with President Roosevelt's splendid exhortation to the Legion to refrain from creating former service men into a "special class."
>
> It joined with President Green of the American Federation of Labor in denouncing inflation, supporting the NRA program and otherwise backing the administration; but it linked pacifists and radicals with criminals, called for a bigger army and navy, and opposed Russian recognition.

The *World-Telegram* sees in this program "a patriotism slightly tainted with class interest, a nationalism slightly tainted with Fascism." We think this mild language. What we see in this program is an ever-present greed held in leash only by the overwhelming emergency of a national crisis. When this emergency is gone, does anyone suppose that the Legion will follow, even "slightly," the wise leadership of the President? Yet there is hope! An American Legion post sent a delegation to the great No More Congress which Communist and other radical groups held in New York the other day. Which prompts us to quote Tennyson's line:

"A beam in darkness: let it grow."

For years—yea, for more than a decade—UNITY has been laughing at the so-called religious census in this country. We have been deliberately derisive, irreverent, even denunciatory. We have declared that this census, for all the authority of the United States government, is absolutely untrustworthy, and, in its optimistic showing of large increases in church membership, plain downright silly, if not actually dishonest. We have found little support for our skepticism. Religious magazines have gone on publishing the figures as though they meant something; and denominational headquarters, struggling with problems of dying churches and depleted funds, have seized upon these census totals and held to them like a drowning man to a piece of driftwood. Only when the figures did not look so cheerful, when even the census could not turn losses into gains, as in the case of the Unitarians and Universalists, did the editors and secretaries set up a howl. Because of course, no matter what the facts, religion must gain! But now at last UNITY has a com-

panion in doubt and denial—no less than the Rev. J. Elliott Ross, scholar and teacher, and influential Roman Catholic. In a recent article in the *Christian Century,* Dr. Ross shows what a farce the so-called federal census is. "As a matter of fact," he says, "this so-called 'Census of Religions' is not federal and is not a census." It is simply a compilation of "figures supplied to it (the federal government) by the different religious bodies" themselves. But these figures are utterly unreliable. A recent critic in the Roman Catholic *Commonweal,* quoted by Dr. Ross, spoke of the "unbelievable untrustworthiness" of the Catholic statistics of church membership. The Protestant statistics are probably worse, though Dr. Ross uses language no stronger than "undoubtedly equal valid suspicions" as directed against them. What is needed, says this outspoken *Christian Century* contributor, is a real census—figures gathered by the U. S. Census Bureau in the same way and at the same time that other figures are gathered. He states the difficulties of getting accurate statistics in this field even by this method. But this is not the reason why it will not be done! The real reason is that the churches do not propose to tolerate, much less further, even a partial disclosure of their dreadful plight.

The Protestant churches of Germany have lost their fight. It was a gallant fight. To the everlasting glory of religion, let it be recognized and remembered that it was the churches alone in Hitler's Reich which refused to bow the knee or run away. For months after the Nazis came to power, the only opposition that existed in Germany at all was that of Protestantism. And when at last it disappeared, it was before the ruthless power of a military tyranny which could no more be successfully resisted than an onrushing locomotive by blades of grass. But even so, the Christian spirit is not dead. The churches have been swallowed up as an anaconda might swallow up so many rabbits, but in these churches still, or driven outside of them as hunted heretics, are valiant men and women who will not sacrifice the cross to the swastika. There are those of course who have conformed, but there are those also who, at peril of sustenance, safety, and life, have refused to conform. How pitiful and also heroic the story of that last synod in Berlin where the Nazis by sheer brute force annexed the church to the state! In the face of wild cries of "treason," "get out," "concentration camps," brave ministers of Christ insisted upon being heard in protest against the Nazi tyranny. The Rev. Mr. Koch, superintendent of the Westphalian district, denounced the spectacle in the teeth of Hitler's agents.

It is obvious (he cried) that brotherly cooperation is not wanted here, but only the ruthless use of force. The methods of the world are being carried into the church.

At last, when further words were vain, seventy-five (75) heroic pastors arose and left the synod, therewith sacrificing their pulpits, their livelihood, their freedom, perhaps their lives. Let Hitler face this fact—and remember Nero and Diocletian!

The Voice Above the Struggle

As I sat in my little room, 14th floor, I heard the Voice, that controls man's destiny, speaking above the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and again above the Anti-War Congress at New York. And this is what I heard:

From Geneva—*The Only Way Is Immediate Total Disarmament.*

From New York—*War Can Be Destroyed Only by Non-Violence and Love.*

1. Geneva's Disarmament Conference

What is to be said about this Conference of the representatives of over fifty nations, in session now for nearly two years? No use to call them a group of hypocrites, for there is clearly a large percentage of honesty—but so far no progress, except sidewise.

I have been present at all the sessions from the beginning—February, 1932—to the long recess—August, 1933. I am aware of the many motives and causes that operate to defeat the hopes of the race for peace—economic, dynastic, racial, nationalistic, all rooted in militaristic security. I early came to the conviction, which was confirmed again and again, that it is folly for the nations to attempt to disarm by degrees or by the abolition of specified weapons of war—on which they *could not* come to agreement—but they should set up the goal of Total Disarmament.

The condition in which Europe and the world find themselves is due to the unwillingness of two or three of the leading Powers to take the step that would give total disarmament. The present "Proposals" which Mr. Henderson has been carrying around in his pocket contain some very ugly suggestions (like bombing from the air, conscription for the European nations). The only positive proposal in them is to set up a "Permanent Disarmament Commission" functioning through the Council of the League, which Council would be controlled by a couple of Powers, especially Britain. If Britain gets this Commission created, it will be all she will want out of the Conference, that is, from a military point of view. I am frank to say that the world has now to fear as coming from Geneva what may well be called a *Pax Britannica.* From this may both the Anglo-Saxon Britain and mankind be saved!

And is there no hope in Geneva? Yes. There is only one condition—the cynic smiles—and history is with the cynic in this—*if* Arthur Henderson and John Simon and Paul Bon Cour would cease talking about "substantial reduction" and "qualitative" and "aggressive weapons"—and come out "boldly" for Immediate Total Disarmament. And, here is the point—to be emphasized—over half of the delegates have declared themselves favorable to Total Disarmament—and the Proposal for Total Disarmament has been already

brought before the Conference twice, and could be quickly recalled—if Britain and France led!

Will you do it—Arthur Henderson, John Simon, Paul Bon Cour?

Such a proposal—sincerely made—would bring about the Cure of Europe's ills, which threaten the whole world.

The Eternal Voice Speaking Above the Conference at Geneva Declares, "The Only Way Is Immediate Total Disarmament."

2. New York's Anti-War Congress

The Anti-War Congress, held in the big St. Nicholas Rink, New York, Sept. 29 to Oct. 1, has just closed. It was followed by a dinner at Hotel Paramount, in special honor of Henri Barbusse, president of the Congress.

This Congress was the successor of the Amsterdam Congress held about a year ago. It was attended by nearly 3,000 delegates, from 35 States. These delegates were of all kinds from Churchmen to Communists—joined in a common opposition to War. From 5,000 to 10,000 were in daily attendance on the sessions, with an overflow meeting the first night at Mecca Temple.

Headquarters for this League Against War movement which promises to be nation-wide may be found at 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Might be well to write down this address.

I attended the Congress at Amsterdam—not because I am a "radical" but because I am 100 per cent opposed to War, which I look upon not only as a crime, but as an insane method of procedure between neighbor-nations.

In this New York Anti-War Congress I noted what I also observed at Amsterdam:

Determination to get-together in common opposition to War. The delegates clearly had many differences, but were determined to build up a united front.

The Congress was conscious that the present social order was on trial, that *now* was the time for action on the part of governments. The cause of war must be destroyed and the means of war abolished.

The Congress made it evident it spoke for the workers of the world, who were chief sufferers in war.

Several hundred speakers took part in the Congress—at mass-meetings and section meetings of farmers, soldiers, teachers, pacifists, youth (more than 1,000 youth in one section), women, etc.

There was a spirit of refreshing immediacy. The question was always uppermost, what is to be done *now*, coupled with the belief that where there is a will there is a way. This Congress was for immediate action—a pleasant contrast to the spirit of delay and "patience" at Geneva. (There is no valid argument for "delay" when we recall that the Allies disarmed Germany almost completely in ninety days!)

There were remedies offered from materialistic Socialism to Quaker absolutist—the two extremes who during the last War found themselves in the same cell on account of opposition to the War!

The officers of the Congress were: Chairman, J. B. Matthew (of the F. O. R.); Treasurer, Annie E. Gray (of the Woman's Peace Society); Secretary, Donald Henderson (director of American Committee for Struggle Against War). On the platform at the same time one could see A. J. Muste, Roger Baldwin, Anna M. Davis, Lola Maverick Lloyd, Robert M. Lovett, Tucker P. Smith, James W. Ford, William Pickens, H. W. L. Dana, Malcolm Cowley—besides the guest from France, the distinguished author, Barbusse, who is devoting his life struggling against War. Also, Tom Mann, militant fighter against War and for Labor, and Professor Alphons Goldschmidt, recently of Germany. Barbusse quickly won the title of the "modern Lafayette" who had come in another kind of a world to help save America *from* War!

One of the most dramatic scenes in the Congress was when the frail Barbusse (speaking in French) was interpreted by stalwart Professor Dana, whose ancestor translated Dante! It must be taken as a significant event and step in any movement—especially in a great moral movement—when the ocean is spanned by the collaboration of two men like Barbusse and Dana! The barriers then begin to crumble. Literary men like singers are most dangerous to the enemies of a cause.

What a blessing if Geneva could be charged through and through with occasional emotion of a high order, even with a slogan or a song such as swept through the Anti-War Congress. There would be more chance for High Heaven to register an idea and compel action. A blending of Geneva and New York would be superb. After all, it takes two wings for a bird to fly.

A Program

A. J. Muste read the Program. It was of course the product of much discussion, before and during the Congress.

It is planned to have a nation-wide organization incorporating the principles involving opposition to war.

Attention is drawn to the rise of imperialistic militarism, and to the injustices of the present social system, threatening war.

Opposition to the Soviet Union is decried.

The struggle against war can be best carried on by the organization of the working class. The anti-war movement must identify itself with the aspirations of colonial peoples for independence.

The manufacturing and transportation of arms must be stopped by demonstrations, picketing and strikes.

American imperialism must be opposed everywhere.

There must be a struggle against whatever leads to Fascism.

All women must be won to the program.

The working men and women—all victims of war—must be aroused and united.

The Barbusse Supper

This was a great event, and well displayed the spirit and motive of the Congress. The great dining-room of Hotel Paramount was packed Wednesday night, October 4th. Cowley of the *New Republic* presided, and did well. What a succession of inspiring speeches! Every man and woman was at his best. Lovett, Dana, Tom Mann, who was "right glad to be here." "Out to struggle against starvation, war and injustice on every front." Mathews, with moving address, took up a collection amounting to nearly $2,000. Again, beware when the people begin to pour out money, as well as to sing! Donald Henderson, organizer, spoke; also, Professor Goldschmidt, fresh from Germany; also Mrs. Bloor and Mike Gold.

And, then Barbusse, with Dana as interpreter. It was Paris and Cambridge joining hands and voices for the sake of mankind. Barbusse referred to the "unforgettable reception in New York," "your sympathy for a great cause."

"It was the War," he said, "that educated me, not only about the horrors of war, but also of the significance of imperialistic wars. It was the *common soldier* with whom I mixed—those who do not understand the causes of war. It is our job to make them understand, and to lead in the struggle of the exploited against the exploiters; the oppressed against the oppressors."

"I was glad to be a common soldier, and to study the causes of war. We must study the causes, for truth is revolutionary. We do not want hot-heads, but those who will see with clarity and act. We must all be fused together in a struggle against war and fascism, until the final conflict when the International Society shall be the Human Race. Our League must be a sample of unity to the very end."

* * *

Of the two—Geneva and New York—give me New York, as a basis for hope. Geneva is so cold, unemotional, legalistic, far away from the realm of the living, willing to be satisfied with the minimum, and not get even that. I see no hope in Geneva, unless there should come some bold dash for real peace, to be found in Total Disarmament. But, New York breathing and eager to move toward a goal that will gain abolition of the War industry, human and knowing War by experience. Carry on, New York! The future lies with you. Your Anti-War Congress stands well in High Heaven, where you have a good press, if not on Earth. Your press is not *Times,* but *Eternities.*

But, New York! says the *Voice Above the Struggle,* I see your good works; how you bury trivialities for a united front. Only one thing I fear for you, that you may seek to cast out War by War. It is a *mistake.* Says the *Voice,* Evil can not destroy Evil, only by the *Good.* Says the *Voice,*

War Can Be Destroyed Only by Non-Violence and Love.

SIDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

Mr. Roosevelt has undertaken, under the authority of the NRA, to cut down the salaries of "movie" stars. Who is there now to say that the President is not a brave man?

The farmer, for all his yelping, gets little sympathy from us. Stupid, selfish, superficially radical but essentially reactionary, the farmer in America is as definitely an obstacle to progress as the peasant in Russia.

The Nazis are expunging from the liturgy of the Protestant churches in Germany the Hebraic phrases, "Amen," and "Hallelujah." In place of the former will be substituted *"Das walte Gott"* (God grant it), and of the latter *"Lobe den Herren"* (Praise the Lord). It is evident that the Nazis are going to make a clean sweep of things Hebraic.—*Ave Wotan!*

The Public Works Administration has allotted $14,800,000 to the Coast Guard, since the Guard is "expecting an *increase* of smuggling activity if the 18th Amendment is repealed." Yet we seem to recall that bootlegging is the result of Prohibition! How come, "wets"? Were you lying, or didn't you know?

Now we know that Hitler is really crazy. Why, the man held a great national festival the other day in celebration of the bumper harvest. He doesn't know that, in this age of unemployment and starvation, huge crops are a calamity, and are to be not eaten but destroyed.

A squirrel, playing around an electrical transformer, got caught in the currents, was electrocuted, and did damage which will take three weeks' work to repair. Here is a public benefactor! Mobilize the squirrels, Mr. President, set them playing around electric plants, and end this depression.

J. H. H.

A Study of the New Defeatism

Dr. Edward Glover, Director of Scientific Research at the London Institute of Psycho-analysis, has digged a pit for the unwary.

His pit is called "War, Sadism and Pacifism." The entrance fee is /6 and the pit is not even cloth-covered; but Mr. C. E. M. Joad has fallen head first into it in a spectacular somersault, staged in the *New Statesman and Nation.*

It is more than a coincidence that Allen & Unwin (the official publishers to the League of Nations in England) should have published Dr. Glover's book hard on the heels of the Einstein-Freud correspondence released by the League's "Institute of Intellectual Co-operation" under the title "Why War?" The League is the class-organ of national capitalist groups; and there is no demonstrable reason for crediting it with any desire whatever to abolish war, except in so far as war is regarded by capitalist statesmen as wast[illegible] ful or unnecessary. In actual fact we observe that the League is energetic in suppressing all minor disturbances that merely dislocate trade relations, whereas it has neither the will nor the power to deal with the imperialist antagonisms inherent within its own component parts.

If I begin, therefore, by explaining that (in the minds of both Freud and Glover) "peace," "pacifism," "the abolition of war" and such expressions produce what another school of psychologists would term a conditioned reflex, the fallacies that follow from this will be obvio[illegible] Glover's book "the League" is continually [illegible] as "Socialism," "Comm[illegible] much [illegible] inte[illegible] the[illegible]

under scrutiny and criticism; but "revolution" does not even find its way into the index. In Dr. Glover's eyes, H. G. Wells ranks as "one of the most distinguished English pacifists of this century!" Even the population problem as a war factor is ignored; and the "advantages of war" are weighed against its evils without the slightest hint that any section of the community gains or loses more than another.

Such a book could be dismissed as merely ridiculous, were it not for Mr. Joad in the foreground and Dr. Freud on the horizon. Mr. Joad, it is true, "does not agree with Dr. Glover's thesis in its entirety." But he adds that he does not wish to criticise it, and he has certainly done a good deal in a very short time to popularize it. In short, we have here a philosophy which, however absurd it may be, numbers among its assets a popular publicist and an authoritarian backing. Add to this that it is a philosophy of defeatism, and the real danger becomes apparent; for what does the average intellectual covet more than a convincing excuse for his own futility? To use Dr. Glover's methods upon himself and his converts, it would not be difficult to find in his arguments a rationalization of some sadistic or massochistic impulse (common to arm-chair intellectuals) which makes them loath to believe in any effective struggle against war, even if war is not their conscious desire. After all, psycho-analysis itself may cover a wish-fulfilment.

Dr. Glover's main thesis is that the principal cause of war is psychological—that it is the work of a destructive instinct manifesting itself in outbursts of mass insanity. It is, in short, the old "human nature" argument in a new guise, presented with a bewildering (and to some, I suppose, very impressive) wealth of technical jargon. Following a practise which I believe is fashionable among psycho-analysts, Dr. Glover prefers to make his case rather by a series of startling assertions than by any serious attempt to establish a causal connection between his facts and his conclusions. This, of course, makes criticism more difficult; but a few points are worth taking up in illustration of the astonishing ignorance which Dr. Glover brings to his subject.

War, to Dr. Glover, is a perogative of the male sex: he can see only man at war with man "girding up his loins to fight the Afghans or Basutos" but not (he assures us in a footnote) Afghan or Basuto women! It would be difficult to find a conception of war more romantically at variance with the facts, especially when our own government has been insisting upon the necessity of bombing frontier villages as a normal aspect of its civilizing mission.

The only obscure reference to a social conflict occurs in a brief comment upon "the peace fanatic," who is dismissed with the observation that "heads may fall in the basket to satisfy his arrears of frustration." This, of course, is quite true, as the experience of revolutions has shown; but it leaves unanswered the very obvious contention that the risk of a revolutionary "terror" is a far more hopeful prospect than the alternative of a capitalist war, which [illegible] infinitely more [illegible]. [illegible], however, [illegible] lies in [illegible] war, [illegible] this [illegible] as good a monument to human fatuity as the "spate

tempt to get rid of war is not only useless but positively anti-social, since it is an attempt to deny mankind one of the few pleasures his existence affords. With most of us however, unaccustomed ourselves to probe our unconscious minds (and unwilling to give up what little freedom we have in the interests of a new army of quacks) our conscious desires seek to guide our intellectual decisions; and there is overwhelming evidence that the mass of people are very far from any conscious desire to be destroyed by one set of scientists in order to satisfy the theories of another. For the pacifist with whom Dr. Glover and Mr. Joad are concerned (who merely tells people either that war is wicked or that it is wasteful) is a nineteenth century anachronism in whom realists are no longer interested. Whatever man's unconscious impulses may be, we say, his instinct for self-preservation is quite clearly a stronger factor—or the number of people who throw themselves under buses would obviously exceed those who skipped out of the way. The problem of war to us is simply that men acting collectively under class domination can be induced to fling themselves beneath the wheels under the sincere impression that they are avoiding a collective disaster; for that is always the essence of the war appeal.

To Dr. Glover the problem does not present itself that way at all, chiefly because his political consciousness is still fumbling about in a backwash of nationalism. To him "a country" is still a homogeneous reality; and he continually misses the main (economic) factor by such naive questions as "Why should any country cut off its own nose to spite its face?" From this confusion arise such astonishing suggestions as that of the Great Powers applying themselves seriously to problems of war and peace (of course through the League of Nations!), or of the psycho-analysis of dictators, foreign secretaries and diplomats *"given co-operation from the parties concerned"*! Or again: "it is just possible that fifty years might suffice to establish in the governing classes the beginnings of a system of psychological good form."

I have called this philosophy of war defeatist, not because it is openly so, but because its constructive proposals are a mere waste of paper. They comprise a "Thousand Years Plan" with an "Interim Report" after the first fifty; and as a crowning piece of impudence we read that "except in case of urgency no large-scale experiment to be initiated before the lapse of fifty years." During this period war is to be averted by miracle whilst the whole human race with its sub-conscious sadism is presumably to submit voluntarily to a psychic subliminal operation under the leadership of the bankers, landlords, armaments manufacturers and others of the same kidney who constitute the governing class.

But this is not all. Just to increase our faith in the methods he is advocating, Dr. Glover treats us gratuitously to a picture of the psychologists in conference, and demonstrates the complete lack of any sort of agreement among these pundits themselves. On one point he reminds us that the psycho-analyst's answer twenty-five years ago "might have been much more emphatic than it would be now"; and one wonders how much more uncertain the psycho-analyst may become in the course of another quarter century. Surely this

of publications" for which Dr. Glover mocks the Behaviorists.

In the meantime the immediate problems remain. The Powers at their conferences stand variously for large navies or for less tanks, for the abolition of aerial bombardment or the limitation of submarines, not in accordance with national eccentricities in the matter of sadism, but in direct relation to the necessities of their various imperial policies, determined in turn by the economic requirements of dominating capitalist groups. In contrast people such as the Norwegians, with no imperialist interests to foster or protect, seem to live in comparative peace without suffering any acute national neurosis, in spite of their ancient exploits as pirates.

Such are the real facts we have to face—not the habits of babies and sexual perverts to which Mr. Joad would now have us turn our attention. It is to be regretted that a leading pacifist should have slipped up so badly on so vital an issue; for if we can solve our economic and political problems once and for all, we need have no fear that men who sang with such fervor:

When this bloody war is over,
Oh, how happy I shall be. . . .

will institute another massacre for the fun of the thing. But the way to that solution does *not* lie through the measureless caverns of the sub-conscious where the ancestral voices of Dr. Glover and Mr. Joad are prophesying war.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

Anachronistic Survivals

Anachronism is the discrepancy between ideas and events. It is either the entertaining of ideas no longer germane to the swiftly moving events and rapidly changing institutions of the present, or it is the attempt to perpetuate and conserve institutional patterns which can no longer justify themselves before the bar of critical insight and enlightened opinion. Anachronism is the "unpardonable sin" against the human spirit. It is the attempt to exalt the letter above the spirit. It is the endeavor to force the new wine of democratic aspiration into the cracking wineskins of an economic feudalism. Because mankind has failed to harmonize theory and practice, the profoundest insight of the human heart and the deepest wisdom of the human mind are sacrificed to the Juggernaut of vested interest and special privilege. We subject the aspirations of men for the good life to a Procrustean bed constructed and fashioned after general ideas formulated in places remote in time and space.

The basic and underlying assumption of all anachronistic thinking and doing is the belief that each generation will live amid substantially the same conditions which fashioned the lives of its fathers. As a result we continue to think of new things in old ways. "Our sentiments teem with embarrassing anachronisms of which we are usually quite unconscious." One generation goes on believing what the previous ones believed. The past is somehow "sacred," it ought not to be tampered with. Anachronism is the moral overrating of the past. Efforts to reform the calendar, to revise obsolete systems of measurement still meet with an opposition that as yet is quite impossible to overcome. Shall the U. S. abandon an impossible isolationist position—and immediately there is a revival of the phraseology of the fathers.

Almost all of the religious beliefs of western Christianity can be traced back to a Syrian desert. The Semitic concept of a deity eternally self-sufficient and underived, possessing none of the aesthetic grandeur of Aristotle's Prime Mover, still dominates the religious thinking of our time. Our sex ethic harks back to the ascetic theories of monasticism. In regard to sexual relations the modern individual is a personality divided against itself. If one intellectually acknowledges the truth of the traditional morality, he will discover in modern practices and conditions a constant emotional challenge to his intellectual beliefs. If, on the other hand, he succeeds in bringing his conscious reason into conformity with present day pra[illegible] may find that he remains emotionally so conditioned that he cannot enter whole-heartedly and aesthetically into any relationship which contravenes the traditional code. In either case the experience remains unsatisfactory and disintegrating.

Anachronism is this disparity between general ideas and emotional patterns. Its evils are escaped only when some degree of harmony between habits of thought and institutional patterns is achieved. Thinking and feeling are attuned to the drum beats of past centuries; conditions and circumstances are racing along in step with the accelerated tempo of the twentieth century. Ancient habits of thought become impediments long before they are discarded.

In many respects our task today is like that which confronted the radical thinkers of the 17th century. Again newer conceptions must supplant the unquestioned, dogmatic assumptions of earlier ages. Revelation, authority, discussion, and meditation alone do not usher in the new day. Again the watchwords have become experimentation, observation, measurement and analysis. However, the fact that while knowledge today increases by leaps, wisdom still tarries, suggests to me the probability that modern empirical thought is vitiated by an anachronistic concept inherited from the 17th century. I refer to the anti-rationalistic temper of much contemporary thought. Newton warned physics to beware of metaphysics, and the radical empiricist today is still chary of general ideas and abstract concepts. It is a mistake to divorce theory from practice, to espouse the inductive method to the exclusion of the deductive.

The discrepancy between theory and practice is always a matter of degree. The process of adjusting ideas to events, and conditions to ideals is an endless task with which each succeeding generation must concern itself anew. We do know, however, that when a society entertains ideas wholly irrelevant to actual existing circumstances, a catastrophic change of some sort is imminent.

Up to and after the World War western civilization was attempting to run a highly complex, sensitive social o[illegible] to rules that were cancelled on the [illegible] from Parliament [illegible] and t[illegible] cile[illegible]

liberalism with its historical meaning of *laissez-faire* impugn the motives of a "brain-trust" at Washington which seeks to "put across" socialistic schemes under the innocuous and disarming nomenclature of liberalism. It cannot be denied that historically, political liberalism resented and actively opposed any interference with individual freedom. Mr. Harold Laski writes: "the second half of the 19th century was mainly occupied with the effort to relax the rigors of an individualistic regime, while retaining a profound and active faith in its main assumptions." The whole series of remedial industrial measures from 1840 on—such as the Factory Acts, Employers' Liability Act, the Housing Acts—were received with indifference or coldness by such liberals as Cobden, Bright, and Gladstone. These acts were concessions made to a humanitarian sentiment which shuddered at the terrible costs of *laissez-faire*. They were not inspired by any belief that it might be the business of the state to see that all citizens realize the full power of development which they possess. One wonders whether we have progressed beyond 18th century liberalism when Mr. Ex-Justice Holmes finds it pertinent to say in his dissenting opinions:

> The 14th Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics." There is nothing I deprecate more than the use of the 14th Amendment to prevent social experiments which an important part of the community desires.

We continue to mouth the shibboleth of an outmoded liberalism that the individual has a right to do as he likes so long as he does not interfere with the liberty of others to do the same.

The liberal political faith of the 19th century represented a compromise between the intensely individualistic, competitive doctrine of strife and an optimistic doctrine of some eventual harmony. Somehow the laws of the universe would insure the issuance of the strife of individuals into a harmonious society. An emotional belief in brotherhood was combined with a relentless competition with individual men. Our contemporaries still effect this combination with ease. Every compromise of this sort is destined to fail. *Laissez-faire* individualism, and competition do not issue in the happiness of the greatest number. Even in an economy of plenty it fails to provide the masses with a minimum of such biological necessities as roofs, rations, and raiment. Marx and his Kapital was and remains the logical alternative to a liberalism that is enamoured with an abstract concept of freedom.

We must remember, however, that all possibilities for a happier human society cannot be reduced to a disjunctive proposition. There remains what Adams in his "Epic of America" calls the American dream:

> A dream of a social order in which each individual shall be able to attain to the fullest stature of which he is innately capable. The dream of being able to grow to fullest development as man and woman, unhampered by the barriers which had slowly been enacted in older civilizations, unrepressed by social orders which had developed for the benefit of classes rather than for the simple human being of any and every class.

That this dream has proved a mare's-nest for untold thousands of the dispossessed of all countries, for all peoples dream this dream, cannot b[illegible] ut that this dream so p[illegible] war, which [illegible] htened [illegible] more suffer[illegible] quite [illegible] war, this [illegible] political smoke-screen behind which our financial giants have hitherto practised their legerdemain is completely dissipated.

I shall content myself with the mention of one more anachronistic survival of the pre-machine age which we must most certainly discard before the new society can come into being. It is generally conceded that so long as we adhere to any sort of money economy at all, industry is dependent upon the maintenance of an adequate purchasing power. Since adequate production is no longer a problem, and since machine-power is undoubtedly replacing man-power, it becomes impossible to maintain an adequate purchasing power on the basis of man-hours. In the new society purchasing power will be based upon the productive capacity of industry and not upon man-hours of labor. This will involve a change in society's atttude to work. Manual labor is to be regarded as almost unnecessary. To regard work as either dignified or degrading is to be guilty of anachronistic thinking. When we speak of a four-hour day, many of the well-to-do are shocked. They cannot conceive how a cultureless individual would be able to use so much resulting leisure. Then too, as Russell remarks, the rich have become remarkably adept in preaching the dignity of honest toil while taking great care to themselves remain quite undignified in that respect. The machine has brought about the paradoxical condition wherein it is possible to increase the general well-being by a simultaneous increase of commodities and diminution of working hours. Realistic thinking will recognize the paradox, and will proceed to adjust institutional patterns thereto.

Most contemporary thinking assumes that change is gradual and slow. Today, says Whitehead, we are living in the first period of human history when the time-span of radical social innovations is considerably shorter than that of an individual life. Progress is now cumulative. There is a shortening in the time-span between notable changes in social customs. The years between 100-1400 A. D. witnessed no real advance in technology. From 1400 to 1700 A. D. such important things as gunpowder and printing were increasingly used. The art of navigation was developed, and the era of discovery was ushered in. From 1780-1830 mechanical inventions came with a rush. What changes shall occur tomorrow no living man can say. The important point to note is that in the past the time-span of important changes was considerably longer than that of a human life. Mankind was trained, and rightly so, to adjust itself to relatively fixed and static conditions. Today the presupposition that conditions remain fixed during one's life-time is quite false, and yet all our economic, political, educational, sociological, and religious theories are colored by that false presupposition.

It must be recognized that the conservative is capable of offering what is, in many respects, a reasoned and articulate defense of the anachronism which we deplore. It may, says the conservative, be impossible to remove some admitted evil without destroying the very social organization which is the basis of that civilization. Or, there may be no known way of removing the evil without the introduction of some worse evil. The conservative has his advocates and defenders. I have no desire to take my place among the latter, but I would understand the strength of the temper against which the radical, humanist, and liberal contend. [illegible] as good be a period in which it is better that the

heavens should fall, but it is folly to ignore the fact that radical changes may bring about that fall.

The mechanisms of our capitalist regime with its host of anachronistic survivals have become so complex that no single formula — socialism, anarchism, guild socialism, technocracy, communism, consumers' co-operation—is likely to have more than a limited application. It is inevitable that there should be hazardous experiment; and the corollary of experiment is failure. Most men would seem to prefer the inadequate good of peace to the cost of ideal good attempted by civil war and violence. Radical experimentation would seem to be the only alternative to disaster or revolution.

Religion, when it has formulated aspirations capable of generating emotional patterns, possesses at once the standard and power to induce that critical discontent which spurs civilization on to new spiritual conquests and saves it from the last traces of anachronism.

THEODORE E. LAPP.

The German Revolution and the Versailles Treaty

Lord Snowden is a convinced Socialist and therefore an anti-Facist. From the standpoint of the political philosophy of a Socialist, he is opposed to the National Socialist revolution in Germany; and he has publicly denounced anti-Semitic measures and other "excesses of the Nazi Terror" (London *Times*). But as a realist Lord Snowden has fathomed the fundamental causes behind this revolution. In the preface of a book, "The German Revolution,"* by Mr. Joseph King, he states his opinion that the German people have extended their support to Hitler because they were persuaded to think that he would be able to remedy some of the injustices inflicted upon them and may even better the economic condition of the populace. "The injustices inflicted upon Germany by the terms of the Peace Treaty (of Versailles), the failure of the Great Powers to redress her grievances and to implement their pledges in regard to disarmament, and perhaps as much as anything the economic depression and the closing of opportunities for the educated classes, have made the German people desperate and responsive to a leader who voiced their feelings and offered a program of relief."

The German people as a whole—Socialists, Communists, Catholic Centre Party, Peoples Party, Nationalists, as well as National Socialists—were unanimous that the Versailles Treaty was grossly unjust, and Germany not alone responsible for the war. However, the National Socialist Party aroused German national enthusiasm by declaring that they would "scrap the Versailles Treaty."

Mr. W. H. Dawson, author of "The German Empire," "Germany and the Germans," an eminent English authority on Germany, has recently published a book, entitled "Germany Under the Treaty"† which may be regarded as a powerful brief in favor of the revision of the Versailles Treaty, especially its territorial provisions. Mr. Dawson at the outset examines the nature of the Versailles Conference, and establishes the fact that there was no negotiation of peace, as the Germans were not given the opportunity to present their side of the case. It was a "dictated peace" which was imposed to carry out a France-Polish program of dismemberment of Germany to the end of weakening her. Mr. Dawson shows that President Wilson did not do his share in upholding the "four points," and often supported unjust claims of Poles, while Lloyd George alone fought for m erate terms in favor of the Germans.

The main purpose of the French Germany might remain by new, all augmented

interest in keeping the fallen Titan permanently down. Behind this motive, however, was another—the shifting of future German pressure from the West to the East, an arrangement obviously to the advantage of France, yet potentially dangerous for Poland.

By careful and painstaking study Mr. Dawson tries to establish the fact that the creation of the "Polish Corridor," the detachment of Danzig, and annexation of German territories in Upper Silesia, by violating the principle of "Self-determination" did great harm to the Germans. He further shows that the annexation of the "Hultschin region" (a part of Upper Silesia) by Czechoslovakia without a plebiscite was an act of injustice. "One of the most arbitrary acts done by the Conference of Versailles was the severance from eastern Prussia of the old German territory of Memelia, or Memel land." Also Eupen-Malmendy was annexed by Belgium through a "sabotaged plebiscite. . . . The annexation was not a noble or generous one on Belgium's part." To be sure, it is planned that Germany shall be returned the Saar region by 1935. However, Mr. Dawson thinks that the French cherish a desire to acquire the valuable mineral resources of this region. He thinks that it would be against Britain's economic and political interest to allow France to control the resources of this region.

Mr. Dawson devotes considerable space to proving that German minorities in Poland and Czechoslovakia are being ill-treated and in an indirect way forced out of these countries. He devotes a chapter on German colonies and proves that the charge that the Germans ill-administered their African colonies was without any foundation, and that it would be to the interest of Great Britain to let Germany have at least a certain part of their former colonies.

French statesmen do not wish that Great Britain should relinquish one square mile of German colonial territory, knowing that if this, the only source of dispute between the German nation and ourselves (the British people), were removed, our country (Great Britain) would cease to help the ring of states interested with France in keeping Germany down, and to that extent their power would disappear.

Mr. Dawson

*Published

†Publish

authorities. Even the Socialists, who were in power in Germany in 1919, were the bitterest opponents of this Treaty, which was imposed upon the German people through the weapon of starvation of women and children.

> The formal signature of the Treaty took place on June 28th. It was formal because there was no escape from acceptance, since the Germans had been told that the alternative was the immediate resumption of the starvation blockade. . . . Nor is it likely that further blockade would have been the only measure of coercion, for the victorious armies of the Allies were prepared for all emergencies. . . . According to one witness on the spot, Marshal Foch had ordered his army in readiness to advance, and with Sir William Robertson had made his plans. Even the bombing of German cities in case of resistance was discussed.

This fact has been recorded by Sidney Huddleston in his work, "Peace-Making at Paris."

Unless some adjustment of the Versailles Treaty is brought about, Germany will in course of time arm for vindication of her national honor, and to recover those parts of lost territories which have been for centuries under German rule. This opinion of Mr. Dawson agrees with what the late Prince Max of Baden wrote to Ramsay MacDonald on October 7, 1929:

> Unless the hope of an eventual revision of the Versailles Treaty becomes evident, Germany will never rest content to look for its deliverance to a policy of peace.

It is clear that as Russia, at an opportune moment, repudiated the Treaty of Paris which was imposed upon her after her defeat in the Crimean War, as France after the World War recovered the lost provinces of Alsace-Lorraine which were annexed by Prussia through the Treaty of Frankfort, similarly Germany will also strive to recover her lost territories, even if it means war. This is the opinion of Mr. Dawson, who deplores the fact that unless the Versailles Treaty is peacefully revised, there will be an inevitable war in Europe.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Badenweiler (Baden), Germany.

The Study Table

Latin America

A book of exceptional importance and timely interest is Callahan's "American Foreign Policy in American Relations."[1]

Its author feels that "the recent pacification of Mexico by adjustments resulting from the mission of Dwight W. Morrow, following two decades of unsatisfactory Mexican relations" makes the moment a fit one for such a book. It is true that our official representatives in Mexico have not always been wisely selected; on more than one occasion they have gone beyond limits in interfering in her internal affairs; often they have been unduly forceful in moments when serious problems demanded delicate handling. Callahan traces the story from 1825, when Joel R. Poinsett began his career as Minister to Mexico, a career in some respects brilliant, but inexcusably meddlesome. In the course of more than a century there have been periods of especial stress—as that of the separation of Texas and the Mexican War, that of the Maximilian intervention and that when President Wilson insisted on fighting a personal war against Victoriano Huerta. The thing that most clearly emerges in connection with the first is that the idea of the separation of Texas (and adjoining territory) and its absorption by the United States antedates considerably the appearance of Stephen Austin on the scene. It was related to that "manifest destiny," which has played such an important part in our national development. As to the [illegible] episode, our author has made a special [illegible] Seward and his part in the matter, [illegible] subject, and here presents [illegible] Wilson period [illegible] that too remain in the reader's mind about Henry Lane Wilson's activities (and non-activities) at the time of Madero's murder. Mr. Callahan is perhaps not called upon to go beyond the records in the archives of the two nations but in view of the special interest of the case he might have hinted at the statement made by the Cuban Minister soon after. It is a small matter for criticism but why does Callahan insist on writing of "President Calles" and "President Rubio"? Probably most of his readers would not identify President Elias and President Ortiz. If it is necessary to meet such ignorance our author should at least call them Elias Calles and Ortiz Rubio. Why not set ignorant readers (fed by our newspaper errors) right? Everyone must approve Ambassador Morrow's kindly and polite dealing with Mexico's officials—unfortunately a thing in marked contrast to the procedure of many of his predecessors; it remains however to see whether his work is permanently beneficial to the country. Did he perhaps lay foundations for a new financial orgy and a "peaceful penetration" which is fraught with danger? But Callahan's book is of great value. It is a necessary book of reference in its field.

And still they come, these books, about South America! We have recently noticed Thompson's "Greater America" and Edschmid's "South America Lights and Shadows." We now have Henry Kittridge Norton's "The Coming of South America."[2] On the outside of the dust cover, on the inside flap, on the extra page and on the title page (four times in all) we read the sub-title *El Resurgimients de Sud America.* Just what the author means is not clear. Probably a Spanish edition of the book has appeared, or will appear, with that title under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which supported [illegible]on's investigation. But let us not quibble, espe- [illegible] when we have so good a book as this. It fits [illegible] tween the two books mentioned above, being less [illegible]id than the one, less pessimistic than the [illegible] starts by completely disavowing [illegible]". If there ever was such a [illegible] no strong bond of

[illegible] Norton. New

union, no well recognized common interest, no uniform character, in the republics to our south. Some of them are largely Indian; some have practically no Indians. Some are Spanish-speaking, one is Portuguese, one is French. Some have made great advancement, others remain stagnant. Jealousies and enmities are as strong between them as between the countries of Europe. All this is true and should be recognized by every student. Still the term Latin America is likely to remain in use, because it has no such definite meaning as Norton would read into it. While this emphasis on diversity in nature and in interests is one of the most important lessons in the book there are several others. Thus, the effect of the "depression" in South America is studied in detail. It is mentioned incidentally by Thompson: Here it is seriously considered. The depression has had economic, social, political reactions. In it our author finds the cause of the series of revolutions of 1930 and 1931. He is no doubt justified, but other causes have been at work—among them perhaps President-elect Hoover's well meant good-will trip. And we fear that revolutions may still be expected though the economic crisis is past. Norton confines his attention to five of the republics—Bolivia, Peru, Argentina, Brazil and Chile. He touches but incidentally on the others. He describes the five revolutions interestingly, better than we have seen elsewhere. He then studies: The Northern Merchant goes South, the Northern Capitalist goes South: He Buys, He Sells. On the whole Norton takes a hopeful view. He believes that a new south America is emerging and that it is important that the relations between it and the United States shall be happy. He describes reactions; he recognizes errors; he advises friendly cooperation. The two continents are by nature connected; they need each other. If cooperation is to develop new attitudes and new methods must be cultivated. It will take long to recover from "the loans." One criticism we make of our author is that he ignores the fact that the loans really mean servitude for the Indian in Peru and Bolivia. He is the man who must repay them, though he did not ask for them or have the pleasure of spending them. The reaction of the man of affairs, through the long stretch from Santiago to Para is thus stated by Norton:

> We Americans were very expansive when times were booming. We loaned, we bought, we established branches, and we sold. Now in the time of reaction we forthwith furnish new and conclusive evidence that all we care about the South American peoples is to make money out of them. We won't lend. We won't buy. We shut up our branch houses because we can't sell. We are fair weather friends and the American of the South is at present fervently vowing never again to rely on such friendship.

When Madero launched his revolution in 1910 bands of helpers under local leaders sprang into existence almost over night. They were composed of men without training—unless indeed gained in banditry—under leaders who had little or no idea of the aims or purposes of the movement. Three of these leaders became popular heroes—Pascual Orozco, Emiliano Zapata, Francisco Villa. All three were from the common people. Orozco had the education and [illegible] of a petty village shopkeeper. Zapata [illegible] bandit. Villa was an *arriero* (m[illegible] There have been several bio[illegible] in Spanish: we know [illegible] English until the[illegible]

and we believe for the most part reliable. Our hero's true name was Doroteo Arango. Only when he decided upon the bandit life did he assume the name of Francisco Villa, which had been that of a notorious bandit of the past. Doroteo Arango was a peon, born into the awful life of an hacienda in northern Mexico. He was a shrewd, quick-witted, observant, hard-working boy, with no education from books. Injustice to his people, whom he loved, and to himself, embittered him. He murdered the man who "forced" his sister and took refuge in banditry in the mountains. When the revolution broke he was the chief of a considerable band, which he took with him to the field. He ill brooked control. If he were to fight he would fight in his own way, leading his own men. Nominally he was under direction of Orozco; in reality he despised him from the moment of their first meeting. The battle of Cindad Juarez was his move; the credit of victory was due to him. He launched it independently, after his superiors had decided it was too dangerous an enterprise. It marked the turning point in Madero's revolution and brought about the conferences which granted his demands and led to his triumphal entrance into the City of Mexico. From the date of that battle Villa's career was a series of exciting events. Personally your reviewer disliked the man from the moment when politicians in Washington attempted to deck him out for some sort of recognition by our government. For that reason he hails this book, which gives a simple narrative and presents the personality of the man as nothing else in English has done. For Villa had many good qualities. The acts most criticized were the natural reaction against intolerable conditions. Pancho Villa was a bundle of contradictions. He loved his mother with a real adoration. In his days of glory he did what he could for the younger members of his family, a poor lot. Naturally keen and shrewd, he sometimes showed a lack of common sense. Why *should* he have gone to Mexico City after he had retired to peaceful country life, handsomely financed by a government, which was anxious to have him out of sight? He glimpsed "great visions," but only half understood them. He had no patience with the idea of sparing a worthless and wicked enemy who had fallen into his hands. He could not understand why Britain should take official notice of the execution of Benton—one of the crowd who had made a hell of northern Mexico and who had grown rich through conditions that ground down the people. Ah! well! the story is as interesting as a novel. It is well told by one who admires Villa and is willing to express his admiration fully. The book is well worth reading, in fact, it is well worth owning. The author may be biased, but we believe he tells an unusually [illegible]

Some time ago we called att[illegible] valuable "Hebrewisms [illegible] have another im[illegible] and C[illegible]

8. "Viva V[illegible] Brace & Co. [illegible]

worship of Whydah, a city of Dahomey: though it was truly a religion, it was the worship of a supreme diety, approached through the serpent as an intermediary. Obeah too was a religion, Ashanti in origin, and in its home land there were two contending religious elements one obeah, black magic, a devil-worship, against which there was a white magic with priests who attempted to counteract obeah. Both elements have come across the sea and both exist today in Jamaica, where the obeah-man works his deviltry and the myal-man attempts to undo the evil spells, and cast out the evil spirits. Both the snake cult of voodoo and the practices of the myal-man have undergone modification in their American surroundings. Voodoo (with the snake largely suppressed) has taken on the drumming, the dances and the hocus-pocus that formed no part of the original cult: myal has borrowed so much that is evil that it is often as black in its wickedness as obeah itself. In Jamaica myal has mingled with christianity and through revivals and religious excitement masquerades dangerously in Methodist and Baptist converts. All this our author seems to bring out clearly enough and in logical form, but in his chapter, *Conclusions,* he becomes confused and blurs the clear picture that he has drawn. Here too he wastes pages in dragging out from the past the unsavory record of Protestant clergymen in Jamaica. We feel that such a long, detailed and critical narration was not essential to his object, which was to show how corrupted myal had come into these dissenting sects. A few words would have completely served his purpose. If such a presentation of Protestant frailties and failures was necessary, it should have been included in the preceding chapter, or have formed a chapter by itself. Its inclusion here merely adds to the confusion already present in this chapter. Our author criticizes such workers as Martha Warren Beckwith, who writes from "a few hurried months in the island"; against this he sets his own six full years in Jamaica. We might expect much from his personal experience, but we get almost nothing. Most of his book is *not* the report of carefully recorded observation but consists of quotations from books old and new of varying value. He does indeed describe his first experience with an obeah man, but it is commonplace and then he tells us that what he saw was not really obeah practice, but a myal-man making a protective fetish. He then goes on to tell us what an obeah-man *might* have done, but it is a composite and not the description of a personal observation. Safely at home, Father Williams may amuse himself by threatening "to light a candle" on some black fellow from the bush, but when he actually comes into contact with obeah he refuses to make that personal observation which carries the greatest significance. Thus:

> While I did not actually witness the diabolical display myself, as I did not feel justified in provoking the evil one to an exhibition merely to satisfy my curiosity, all the men, women and children there present agreed in their testimony of what had happened.

FREDERICK STARR.

Correspondence

From Our Bulgarian Correspondent

Editor of UNITY:

You terminate your first leaderet, in UNITY of the 21st of August last, with the words:

> Every prospect pleases,
> And only man is vile.

It may interest you to hear of a Bulgarian saying: *God sinned when he created man.*

We can presume as to how things were carried on in the world before the advent of man, but we know for certain how they proceeded and how they continue since his advent. The history of man from his earliest existence, as known to us, has been the same, a life of passions: envy, greed ever for more and more possessions, disregard of the warning: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's land mark." These passions have necessarily evoked that of revenge, and revenge for revenge has been the guiding destructive force.

Gambetta, in his greatness, said: "Think of it [illegible] do not speak of it"; in other words—nurse your [illegible] we any doubt of the Germans thinking [illegible] more, they are talking of it and [illegible] feels it and knows it, [illegible] while of acting [illegible] thac[illegible]

[illegible] it not a *puzzling* situation that countries who [illegible] Wi[illegible]fted most by the war at the expense of others [illegible] tween t[illegible] dreams, which have been recreated [illegible] did than [illegible] war, which did the least in the [illegible] starts [illegible] or *the Little Entente,* are [illegible] If [illegible] st all concessions to- [illegible] no [illegible] ceful solution!

[illegible] s created in thought and spoke that the world would necessarily be better, would be more reasonable, that humanity would speak and would assert itself. No, man has not improved, in evil doing he has scored a new record. Today one state can be sincere towards another only when it sees sincerity in that other, but as each waits to see it in the other, it never sees it. Every state is struggling against deception, countering intrigue against intrigue.

A fresh war has been avoided and is avoided because of the general poverty, because of the struggle for the daily bread, the necessity to live, and relations and interests between nations are so intertwined that no war can be limited to two.

Alas, where are the pacts of peace? The more we appear to be approaching peaceful conditions the more are we estranging ourselves from them. Nevinson's work, that of Kellogg and Briand are on the shelves; the League of Nations is a farce; they have become subjects for classical study. The main questions which alone can lead to better conditions are avoided systematically because they clash with *interests.* Passions in war have been succeeded by passions in peace, the latter are degrading, they have to do with unsatiated selfish interests only, they are void of the nobility of self sacrifice so prominent in the first.

sin—*God sinned when he created man,* says a Bulgarian proverb! * * *

Delegates are arriving from many countries, to represent churches to the Conference to be held in Sofia: "The Universal Conference for International Peace Through the Churches." For the past ten and more years these delegates have met now in one place, now in another. I do not know of any progress made towards the attainment of their object. All efforts to break out from the chaos seem to be condemned before they are attempted.

Sofia, Bulgaria. P. M. MATTHEEFF.

Fascism in America

Two Colorado educators, Professors A. D. H. Kaplan and C. C. Eckhart, have recently returned from Germany, and are now administering severe verbal trouncings to the dangerous paranoics who have guillotined liberty in the Reich. They brought back accounts of revolting atrocities perpetrated by the Nazi blackguards against Jewry and other minority groups. Their stories are shocking large audiences in the west.

Many other educators and editors have warned us of the evil results of racial and religious bigotry as manifested in contemporary Germany. They have pointed out thousands of cases of brutal persecution and official terrorism in the land of Hitler. They have called for an economic boycott against the German nation, and for funds to care for destitute German refugees.

Obviously, Fascism constitutes a challenge to civilization itself. The Nazis have renounced the use and authority of reason and justice; they have ruthlessly swept aside every principle of the Weimer constitution, every ideal which makes life worth living for decent and honest citizens. By official and unofficial lynchings, by blood and bombast, by ridiculing conscience and culture, by outlawing the ballot box, by choking speech and throttling press—by these have the Nazi gangsters destroyed the hard-wrought labor of centuries and dragged down an honored people to the level of their own savagery.

The American educators and editors who are calling our attention to the ignorant passions of the starving German mob, to the ferocity of the terror stricken victims of Versailles, and arousing our resentment against the demagogues now misgoverning Germany, are performing a needed public duty and their zeal should be applauded.

But how much more deserving of fame would our educators and editors be were they to protest as vociferously and omnipresently against the suppression of civil liberties in the Philippines, in Los Angles, in Illinois, Kentucky and Colorado where freedom of conscience and speech is still guaranteed by both federal and state constitutions!

How many of them have denounced the barbarities of the Colorado strike, where official and compan[y] lawlessness resulted in the smothering of wome[n] children to death at Ludlow? How many r[e]tives of higher education and of the pre[s] official lynching of Sacco and V[a] have waxed indignant over th[e] publicized their indigation?

The spirit of Fa[s]cause it is the [s]political int[e]Ku Klux

not committed to a policy of toleration and liberty. We are—in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution.

In America today there are two organizations openly calling themselves Fascists—the Silver Shirts and the Khaki Shirts. In their pledges and platforms they are avowedly anti-atheist, anti-Jewish, anti-Communist, anti-Socialist, and anti-pacifist, and 100 percent defenders of the flag. Their organizers furnish free shirts, soup and guns to morons, desperados and derelicts. They are gaining in numbers every day.

At the moment the Khaki Shirts are busy railroading to the electric chair a young man of New York City. Not because he is guilty of crime, but because he is an indefatigable and outspoken enemy of the fascistic Khaki Shirts. How many of our educators and editors will, remembering Joseph Pulitzer, rise up in humanitarian wrath and smash the frame-up of Terzani? R. J. WESTLAKE.

So. Charleston, Ohio.

"A Song of Revolt"

EDITOR OF UNITY:

Enclosed is a single dollar, for which I would like a few copies of the issue for September 4. I want to distribute Whitaker's fine creed in that issue, as far as possible. If at any time you have occasion to address him, tell him there are at least a few compatriots of his who welcome his stanzas as one more help toward man's freedom. Whether Socialism or Communism, or what not, *Something* is on the way more speedily now than ever before. And the sooner the better.

Whitaker's word is a great word, and finely expressed. It has also what most radicalism lacks—the touch of true literature. It is a poem as well as a "tract."

This issue is excellent almost all through—but every issue is valuable, and continuous pounding must in time drive some nail in fast, and clinch it on the other side. At least that is our great hope.

San Diego, Cal. JAMES H. WEST.

Conditions in Germany

[From a Private Letter]

"Political conditions in Germany are very discouraging. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, etc., are no longer existent. An intolerant, cruel nationalism, which, in addition, is very stupid, is in full sway. Not only Jews, but also people of true culture, are being brutally oppressed. Many of these people have been killed—many others are interned in camps, where they are subjected to the most barbaric treatm[ent]. the surface, the order and discipline [of] sides may deceive the onlooke[r] such methods are ce[rtain] development [of] thi[s]

The Field

(*Continued from page 70*)

Not only has he never advocated communism (though he may not have closed his mind blindly against it), not only has he never preached the overthrow of government that has given him asylum, but he has explicitly *not* renounced his pacifism. So much was stated in the last paragraph of the dispatch from Brussels.

Seeking confirmation of this rumor of his apostasy, I have searched the columns of your distinguished contemporary, the New York *Times,* almost in vain. In its issue of September 12th, however, I found on page 10, embedded in an item from Berlin reporting the spitefulness with which the Hitlerite press featured the report of Prof. Einstein's flight from Belgium to England, upon learning of Nazi threats against his life, the following cautious paragraph:

> Another paper (in Berlin) charges that a letter was recently written by Dr. Einstein to a certain M. Nahon of Belgium, in which Dr. Einstein is alleged to have said that if Belgium were to go to war with Germany, and he were a Belgian, he would, under the existing circumstances, unhesitatingly offer himself for war service, despite his otherwise strongly pacifist convictions.

The difference in style and treatment of this report, as published in the *Tribune* and the *Times,* is a measure, I take it, of the very human, and unscientific, way in which editorial prejudices are permitted to color, or discolor, fact and news.

But assuming that the physicist-philosopher did, in fact, express himself in a way to suggest that pacifism is not a glittering abstraction, like some mathematical formula, but a principle of human behavior requiring courage and a clear appreciation of psychological, political and economic circumstances to be effective, or that he wrote under the emotional strain and excitement induced by the horrors of Hitlerism as he has observed them, why should any American, not a professional sword-swallower or machine-gunner, gloat over the tragedy? Obviously, the one encouraging element in the psychotic condition of the German people today is the reported existence of, perhaps, 50,000 conscientious objectors to Hitlerism among them—men and women who cannot be counted upon to execute its political felonies, abroad or at home, and who are, therefore, wrongfully imprisoned in barbarous concentration camps, without right to trial or *habeas corpus,* lest they impede the consolidation of its absolutism and arouse resistance to its *Schrecklicheit.* The one logical attitude for Dr. Einstein, if not for the *Tribune* to adopt, would be to stress the importance of the service which these moral non-conformists and resisters are rendering to liberty, to Germany, and to the defense of Europe, and to seek ways and means of encouraging them and of relieving their misery. If they are the most hated obstacles to despotism in Germany, why should they not be twice-welcome to civilized America, whose libertarian ideals have admittedly been in a grave state of eclipse? What is gravel for a mad goose can ill be spurned by the all-wise gander. Let us think straight about this important matter, and not be deceived by political propaganda,

Yours, etc.,
BRENT DOW ALLINSON.
Ravinia, Illinois.

Position Wanted

A reader of UNITY, middle-aged, would like position as companion or housekeeper, Nov. 1st. Address Miss H., Box 552, Charlottesville, Va.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

THE MODERN THINKER

A Magazine of Current Thought

Prospects of Materialism...J. B. S. Haldane
Must There Be War?.....Albert Einstein
Science—Aid or Scourge?....Julian Huxley
Machines and the Future....Havelock Ellis

THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGIST

A Magazine of Contemporary Psychology

How to Adjust Your Personality.Alfred Adler
An Analysis of Belligerence..Sigmund Freud
Living in a World of Pictures..Carl G. Jung
Fears and Their Elimination..Smiley Blanton
Left-Handedness in a Right Handed World.....W. Beran Wolfe

THE NEW CURRENT DIGEST

A Resume of the Outstanding Periodical Literature

The Outlook for Education.....H. G. Wells
Reforming the Government...Bernard Shaw
Nature's Storehouse of Health..Helen Keller

KNOWLEDGE

A Magazine of Scientific Progress

The Story of Blood Transfusion—What Makes a Dwarf—The Lowest Living Types of Man—Some Facts About Hypnotism—Where Did Life Originate?—How to Break a Bad Habit.

25c at better newsstands. Send 25c for sample copy or $1.00 for half-year subscription to Modern Scientific Publications, 310 Riverside ...ive, New York City.

...HALL PASS

.....

.....